



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

century; that point is fully proved; for the rest it is an attractive summary of the enduring work of a well-bred, selfish, highly educated, and slightly miserly gentleman.

CHARLES M. HOUGH.

*Three Peace Congresses of the Nineteenth Century.* By CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN, WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, ROBERT HOWARD LORD. *Claimants to Constantinople.* By ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1917. Pp. v, 93. \$75.)

FOUR of the most timely papers read at the Cincinnati meeting of the American Historical Association have here been collected and delightfully published, with a prefatory note by Professor H. E. Bourne, under the imprint of the Harvard University Press. The papers, because of their pertinency to the present war and its issue and also because of the well-recognized competency of their authors, should now be read with pleasure and profit by a wide circle.

Messrs. Hazen, Thayer, and Lord, in dealing respectively with the Congresses of Vienna, Paris, and Berlin, have not bored us with repetitious discussion of the detailed problems that came before the assembled diplomatists or of the merits of the solutions reached. Rather, they have all conformed admirably to the dictum laid down by Mr. Hazen that he would content himself with describing "the manner in which the Congress approached its problems, the way in which it handled its business, its mode of organization, its methods of work, the machinery it employed in the discharge of its highly complicated task". To many it will seem a pity that the authors have not broadened the scope of their papers sufficiently to admit of some indication of the hopes and aspirations voiced in the press and popularly entertained immediately before, and during, the several congresses. Such hopes and aspirations—even prior semi-official pronouncements of the governments concerned—have so often been at variance with the treaty achievements, that a frank recognition of this fact might go far to restrain undue optimism about the millennium's being ushered in by the congress which will terminate the present war. With the exception of Mr. Lord's passing reference to the petitions of representatives of the Alliance Israélite and of the Peace Society to the Congress of Berlin, the congresses are considered as jousting matches for brightly caparisoned (though not over-chivalrous) noble diplomatists, never as dickerings of cabals unrepresentative of their fellow nationals in social position, in manners, in purpose, and in "interests". Perhaps the authors have done wisely to exclude consideration of contemporaneous public opinion of the congresses, for otherwise their studies would have been expanded to much larger dimensions, would have lacked unity, and would have engulfed the "gentle reader" in a most desperately abysmal slough of pessimism.

As it is, the effect of the hour's perusal of the three papers is to

produce a feeling bordering on despair. The most striking lesson to be drawn from the Congress of Vienna is that a power, overwhelmingly defeated on the battlefield and actually occupied in large part by the victorious troops of a grand alliance, may, if it has a diplomatist of the calibre and shrewdness of Talleyrand, set its conquerors at variance one with another and in the name of "legitimacy" or of some other mouth-filling fiction preserve its territorial integrity and continue to play a rôle as a great power. The Congress of Vienna was not even a congress, yet it accomplished much more of permanent value than did the Congress of Paris. In the latter there is only a comedy of errors played by a humorous green-table troupe—the pompous, ponderous, Palmerstonian Clarendon; Walewski, the much-talking and little-thinking agent of Napoleon III.; the "arrogant, mannerless, and haughty" Count Buol; the bluff, jovial, "old-soldierly" Count Orloff; and the Turkish grand vizier, "the only self-made man"—as much like Gilbert-and-Sullivan in their procedure as they were like Hamlet in their crazy and tragical achievements. It is not surprising that historical interest has centred less in this burlesque than in the two side-shows which accompanied it—the Declaration of Paris on maritime law in time of war, and the quiet but effective intrigues of Count Cavour.

Both at Paris and at Vienna the visiting diplomats were constantly distracted from business by banquets, receptions, and balls; at Berlin, they had only to retire to Bismarck's buffet and to sample his "jug of port", and they were forthwith refreshed and invigorated for the tasks before them. Yet in sheer futility the Congress of Berlin outrivalled its predecessors. Mr. Lord, after endorsing the statement that "the treaty of San Stefano was the wisest measure ever prepared for the pacification of the Balkan Peninsula", affirms that had the powers other than Russia

been actuated only by disinterestedness, moderation, and foresight, they would then have assembled in congress resolved, at the least, to confirm the essential arrangements of San Stefano, to stipulate analogous arrangements for the western half of the peninsula, and to provide for the collective guardianship of Europe over the organization and free development of the liberated nations.

That they did nothing of the sort was due to their indifference to the principle of nationality, to their unfounded jealousy of Russia, and to the fact that they consulted only their own selfish interests; their selfishness was to bear fruit in wars of the twentieth century.

In a word [concludes Mr. Lord] the great fault of the Congress of Berlin, as of so many congresses in the past, was the failure to recognize that the peace of Europe is not ensured nor the interests of any Power permanently served by creating unnatural, unjust, and intolerable conditions; the failure to recognize that even in international politics justice is, in the long run, the surest foundation of states and nations.

All the papers are interesting and suggestive. Mr. Thayer's alone is rather shabbily dressed so far as literary form is concerned and not exactly punctilious in its impartiality; the author of *Germany versus Civilization*, in characterizing Prussian diplomatists, even the aristocratic Manteuffel, must needs lay aside his sense of humor and his mellow historical-mindedness in favor of a somewhat unseemly vindictiveness. Brennus could hardly be a prototype of modern Prussian diplomacy, as Mr. Thayer maintains, for Brennus was a Celt!

Mr. Coolidge's article on "Claimants to Constantinople" is a clear, well-balanced, and fair-minded, though appropriately brief, account of the most difficult question in the international relations of modern times. It deals mainly with the political aspects of the problem, and only incidentally with the economic. Mr. Coolidge brings out best "the clash between the interests and we may say the legitimate ambitions of Russia and Germany". So baffling to us does he make the clash that he can have a good laugh at us by suggesting "that the Russians shall have Constantinople and the Straits, and the German railway shall go under them somewhere by a tunnel". But what will be the effect of the revolution at Petrograd upon Russian claims to Constantinople?

CARLTON J. H. HAYES.

*Herbert Spencer*. By HUGH ELLIOT. [Makers of the Nineteenth Century, edited by Basil Williams.] (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1917. Pp. vi, 330. \$2.00.)

THE editor of the series in which this volume belongs is safe in his observation that (p. v), "Whatever may be thought to-day of the value of Spencer's writings, no one who wishes to understand the thought of the nineteenth century can neglect him." There will be more dissent from the editor's further opinion (p. vi), "As far as one can see, whether as a philosopher or as a man of science, Spencer is not likely to live for future generations."

Not all the men and women who, in the seventies of the nineteenth century, were beginning to take philosophical problems seriously, and who were fascinated by Spencer, have thought beyond their preceptor. A faithful few remain whom Mr. Williams's objectivity will affect as impurity. What will these few say to the brutal frankness of the biographer himself? He tells us that he accomplished his first reading of the *Synthetic Philosophy* while he was in active service on the South African veldt. His appraisal of that work at the time may be inferred from the further detail: "Not infrequently I had little other baggage than a toothbrush and a volume of *The Principles of Psychology*" (p. 5). Fifteen years later, after a second reading of Mr. Spencer's works, together with a collateral study and consultations with many of the author's most intimate friends, Mr. Elliot had reached the conclusions which his book elaborates: